

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Please find attached two sheets of drawings for Figures 1 and 4.

The attached sheet of drawings (sheet 1/6) includes changes to Figure 1 and replaces the Replacement Sheet 1/6, filed March 16, 2006, with Figure 1. In Figure 1 reference number 110, and an accompanying lead line, have been added to indicate the gearbox, in order to conform the drawings with the claims.

The attached sheet of drawings (sheet 4/6) includes changes to Figure 4 and replaces the Replacement Sheet 4/6, filed March 16, 2006, with Figure 4. In Figure 4 reference number 110, and an accompanying lead line, have been added to indicate the gearbox, in order to conform the drawings with the claims.

The drawings are believed to overcome the objections in paragraph 1 of the Office Action.

**Remarks**

This Preliminary Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated **June 7, 2006** and is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants have included replacement sheets.

Also, Applicants have amended the specification in order to conform the specification to the claims and the drawings as filed. No new matter was added.

Claim 9 was objected to because of informalities.

Claims 10 – 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1 – 4, 6 – 14, 16, 20 – 24, 26 – 34, and 38 – 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grass DE Publication No. 3,504,854 (“Grass”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,803,437 to Paterson et al. (“Paterson”).

Claims 35 – 37 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but deemed to contain allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1, which is similar in scope to independent claim 20, to include the limitations of claim 35, which the Examiner stated contained allowable subject matter.

Applicants have canceled claims 20 – 41, and have added new claim 42 – 44, directed to the subject matter of claims 35 – 37 and rewritten in independent form and including all of the limitations of the base claim 20 and any intervening claims.

The following comments are presented in the same order and with headings and paragraph numbers corresponding to the Office Action.

### **Drawings**

1. The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, specifically the gearbox and the safety brake.

Applicants have canceled all claims referring to the safety brake thereby mooted the drawing objection as to the safety brake.

As indicated above, Applicants have attached Replacement drawings, namely Figures 1 and 4, to indicate the gearbox. Reference number 110, and an accompanying lead line, have been added to indicate the gearbox, in order to conform the drawings to the claims.

### **Claim Objections**

2. In the Office Action, claim 9 was objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended claim 9 and believe that the claim as currently amended overcomes the objection.

### **Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 112**

4. Claims 10 – 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully disagree.

5. Regarding claim 10, although Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would not find claim 10 indefinite given the information presented in the specification, Applicants have amended claim 10 to overcome the indefiniteness rejection.

6. Regarding claim 11, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on the grounds that one of ordinary skill in the art, knowing that a factor of safety is “a multiplier applied to the calculated maximum load (force, torque, bending moment or a combination) to which a component or assembly will be subjected” and given what is presented in the specification, would understand what the factor of safety applies to and how it was determined.

[[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Factor\\_of\\_safety](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Factor_of_safety)]

7. Regarding claim 12, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on the grounds that one of ordinary skill in the art, knowing what a factor of safety is and given what is presented in the specification, including the range presented in claim 12, would understand what the factor of safety applies to and how it was determined.

8. Regarding claim 13, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on the grounds that one of ordinary skill in the art, knowing that a coefficient of friction is “the ratio of the weight of an object being moved along a surface and the force that maintains contact between the object and the surface” and given what is presented in the specification, claim 13 is not indefinite because the materials are selected such that in combination they have a low coefficient of friction.

9. Regarding claim 14, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on the grounds that one of ordinary skill in the art, knowing that a coefficient of friction is “the ratio of the weight of an object being moved along a surface and the force that maintains contact between the object and the surface” and given what is presented in the specification, including the range

specified in claim 14, claim 14 is not indefinite.

**Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103**

11. Claims 1 – 4, 6 – 14, 16, 20 – 24, 26 – 34, and 38 – 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grass in view of Paterson.

Applicants have amended claim 1 with the limitations presented in claim 35 and any intervening claims. Claim 35, which depends from independent claim 20, includes allowable subject matter, as stated by the Examiner in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicants believe that claim 1, as currently amended, contains allowable subject matter, and respectfully request that the rejection be removed and claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2 – 4, 6 – 14, and 16 depend from independent claim 1 which, as presented above, is nonobvious. Therefore, claims 2 – 4, 6 – 14, and 16 are also nonobvious and Applicants request that the rejections be removed.

Applicants have canceled claims 20 – 41, thereby mooted the rejections.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

120. In the Office Action, claims 35 – 37 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but deemed to contain allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have canceled claims 35 – 37 and have added new claim 42 – 44, directed to the subject matter of claims 35 – 37 and rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. No new matter has been added.

New claims 42 – 44 are believed to overcome the objections and are further believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**


In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the application, with pending claims 42 – 44 is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to put the application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: October 10, 2006

By:   
James L. Shands  
Registration No.: 54,439

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000  
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185  
Telephone: (952) 563-3000  
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001  
f:\wpwork\jls\11534us01\_amd\_20061005.doc